

**MINUTES OF THE GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
JULY 26, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** CHAIR BOWERS, AYSCUE, COLEMAN, FREYALDENHOVEN, HATFIELD, HENSLEY, KELLY, STOUT, WHARTON.

**STAFF PRESENT:** STEFAN-LEIH GEARY and MIKE COWHIG, Housing and Community Development (HCD); MIKE WILLIAMS, ESQ., City Attorney's Office.

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Bowers called the meeting to order at 4:09 p.m. and welcomed everyone. She introduced members of the Commission and gave a brief overview of how items were to be presented and the method use for any appeals from Commission decisions.

All persons wishing to speak at today's meeting and staff were duly sworn or affirmed. Chair Bowers said should anyone else decide to speak later, they could be sworn or affirmed at that time.

Chair Bowers confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets; no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda; no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES**

None.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES JUNE 28, 2006 MEETING**

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved adoption of the minutes of the June 28, 2006 meeting as submitted, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING)**

- a) **Location: Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street**  
**Historic District: College Hill**  
**Application No. 769**  
**Applicant: Susan Sessler**  
**Property owner: Greensboro College**  
**Date received: May 5, 2005**

**Description of work:**

Construction of shelter in parking lot behind Welcome Center on West Market Street for HEAT program. (update)

Ms. Geary said the Commission first saw this at the May meeting. The Commission voted in favor of the application for the shuttle service for the HEAT transportation route and the shelter that will be placed on the Greensboro College Campus. When the Commissioners voted in favor of that, they did put some conditions on it. Earlier the Greensboro Transit Authority (GTA) did not think they could meet those conditions, which is why it was brought back to the Commission last month. Since then GTA, Greensboro College and the College Hill Neighborhood Association have met and have actually put the

shelter in a location that meets the conditions. She read the motion at the May meeting so the Commissioners would remember. She had Mr. Cowhig put the site map on the overhead screen and described the route that the buses would take. She said it was on record as to the type shelter approved.

- b) Location: 912 Walker Avenue**  
**Application No. 791**  
**Applicant: James Cassell, Contractor**  
**Property Owner: Laura Little**  
**Date Application Received: 7-12-06 (reconsideration denied)**

**Description of Work**

Request for reconsideration of Denied Application for Certificate of Appropriateness.

Removal of balcony railing.

**New information for reconsideration.**

Jim Cassell, 2022 Raven Mill Road, said after the last hearing, he had Mr. Cowhig come out and go over the property. He had told the Commission that it would cost between \$14,000-\$18,000 to redo the porch because when the house was built, it was built with regular 2x4s for the roof trusses and 2X4s for the porch jerseys for the overhang, etc. It is on a hip roof part that goes across on the front porch. To put anything back up there they would have to redo the whole porch because it would not pass any kind of inspection on it because the house is so old and it is basically not up to Code in any part of it. That is why it would cost so much to put it back. Basically it just had the rails across the front with no pan there. It does not serve any purpose at all for it to be there. Nobody can go out onto the porch and it is basically there for looks. Therefore, he would like for the Commission to take this into consideration and allow them to do away with the porch.

Ms. Geary said she spoke with Mark Stewart with Building Inspections and he said without his going back and being on the site, it would be hard for him to say what all would be required. However, he said that the reinstallation of the railing for decorative purposes, as long as there was no access to it, would not even be a Building Code issue. The issue comes into play when they actually create the actual balcony again. Then the railing would have to meet specifications if there were access to it. It appears to her from the pictures, but she remembers the door as being sided over so the permanent access to the balcony has been removed. She thought the question now is whether they need to go back in and actually carve out that balcony opening versus just have the faux balcony, just the railing, which she thought is what Mr. Cassell is saying was actually there. It had been boarded over in the past and was not a functional balcony anymore. Essentially what he did was just remove the balcony and re-roof over it.

Mr. Cassell said the only thing there was the rails and they were rotten and were falling apart. He thought Ms. Little's father had had it removed several years ago before it came into the historic district and it had been plywooded over with shingles only. It had a rubber piece around the bottom with a 2' X 6' on it for the rails to be put on. They just took it all up and put new shingles down.

In response to a question from Mr. Stout, Ms. Geary said Inspections did not mention the rehab code. The only thing they said was to talk about the rehab code briefly as that is one of the reasons why he could not comment completely on how much would have to be rebuilt, but the main issue was with the decorative access gone versus functional and that the decorative railing being there is different than having the full-fledged balcony, which is an invitation for people to come out on it. So it does not mean it

cannot be done, but it does bring in safety and code issues. Right now the balcony is gone. So unless the Commission says that they want the owner to go back and carve out that balcony again and then put up the railing, then that would probably trigger another conversation with Building Inspections about how that works.

Mr. Cassell talked with Butch Simmons with the Inspections Department and Mr. Simmons told him that if they went in there to do that, everything would have to be restructured on the whole front of the house because it consists of some kind of lead pan or something that goes in there and there would have to be double bands put across the front and down the sides for the band to sit in with a floor in it with a pan to set into with the sides coming up and joining into the house itself. Then they would have to inspect everything because the roof ceiling would have to be taken out and the plywood and everything else so they could see all the structural parts of it.

Mr. Cowhig said at the last meeting, they had submitted an application, which was considered after-the-fact, to remove a balcony that was an original feature of the house. When they were doing the repair work to the house, they were reroofing the porch and felt that the balcony was so deteriorated, they would just sheet it over. That is what they were applying for at the last meeting. It was staff's understanding when they presented this, that the balcony was actually an open balcony and there was a doorway there that had been covered over with siding before the district was created because documentary photographs show that. So it is an architectural feature that is sitting out there, exposed to the weather and it is not hard to understand that it would have deteriorated. The Commission turned that application down, meaning that the balcony had to be rebuilt. So he met with Ms. Little and Mr. Cassell on site to discuss the rebuilding of the balcony because, in his opinion, if it were going to be rebuilt, it is going to require some engineering work. Somebody has got to actually design it so it drains correctly and it is constructed properly and meets Code. As he was talking to Mr. Cassell, he explained that the balcony had actually been sheeted over with plywood previously before he ever came on the scene. Mr. Cowhig was not aware of that. His proposal was to install the railing system back on top of the roof, using a piece of plywood and 2' X 6's and a rubber piece. Then Mr. Cowhig realized that this was not what staff explained, this is not how they explained it to the Commission. So probably the first thing to do would be to go back to the Commission and make sure everyone understands what it was like when the work began. That is why this is a request for a reconsideration.

Mr. Cowhig said in looking at it, it is a fairly complex feature there. In these old balconies, there is a metal pan and there are drainage pipes that are built into the roof. This was done when the house was built usually, but there is some engineering to it to make it work correctly. Once those drainage systems fail, which they often do, you have got a real maintenance problem that has to be dealt with at some point. The way Mr. Cassell proposed rebuilding it, and he understood his reasoning, he was not sure if that is the way we would want to see it done. If it is going to be restored and put back, it needs to be put back correctly and Mr. Cassell pointed out some building code issues that staff was not aware of totally or did not totally understand at the last meeting. He made the point that it would be quite expensive to rebuild this. He thought they were all a little skeptical with the price he gave, but then when you factor in rebuilding the structure at the porch roof to meet the code and function properly it could get pretty expensive. One option is simply to document the balcony and who knows, somewhere down the road someone, a future owner 50 or 100 years from now, may decide to restore that entrance and restore the balcony. It would be a nice feature but it requires regular maintenance and it needs to be constructed properly and that can be very expensive. He thought the problem here is that it deteriorated over time, it was not maintained properly and they did the best they could, but those things do deteriorate and once they start leaking, the water gets into the roof structure and causes all kinds of problems. So it is a real dilemma. It is a feature that the Guidelines would certainly recommend retaining, but from a practical standpoint, it is difficult and expensive.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said it seemed there were three options: 1) The go back as it would have originally been, which it has been blocked over; 2) Let it go just shingled like this; or 3) Simply apply the railing on top of the shingle work that has been done to retain the balustrade look, but not have an effective balcony.

Mr. Cowhig said Mr. Cassell's suggestion was to attach it to the existing roof, using a plywood base.

Mr. Cassell said if the Commission would look at the picture being shown, they would see that the plywood still goes all the way across the porch now. It doesn't have anything there, but rails. You can see there is no drainage system or anything else. Whoever had applied the plywood before had just built rails there in front because it was already done before it came into the historical district. So he did not see where there would be three options, there would be only one, and that would be putting it back just the way that it came off, which was the pickets itself with the rail across the front because he did not think it would be Ms. Little's obligation to have to go in there with that kind of expense to have something done in this manner that was not even done when she inherited the house.

Mr. Cowhig said the picture being shown was taken in the early 1990s.

Ms. Hensley said the balcony structure itself had already had plywood over it at that point.

Ms. Hatfield said it looked to her as if the balcony was there, even though the doorway had been boarded over. The picture seems clear that there was an indentation in the roof and there was a pan and there was still a balcony. That shows that the condition, at least part of the time at it was a historic district, was the original way. She did not know if they could just go back and say, "You only have to do a little change" when you did the whole change during the time it was in a historical district.

Counsel Williams said they were not sure when that picture was taken. There is no date on that picture.

Ms. Hensley said nothing was documented before this work was started so the Commission has to make a lot of assumptions as to the way things were.

Counsel Williams said Mr. Cowhig could say what the condition was when that piece came in because he saw that and he can say whether or not there was an indentation in it at that point.

Mr. Cowhig said the roof was completely sheeted when he was there. He had seen the house and was very familiar with the house. When he saw it first was when they had already taken the shingles off and had started putting new plywood on it. The resheeting had been done.

Mr. Cassell said no plywood had been done. What they had done was took the shingles off in this area and this area. The rest of the shingles were still on it. He had to cut out a 2-foot piece by 4-foot piece of plywood to go back in because it was damaged and he put a 2-foot by 4-foot piece in there that matched up on two joists because they are on a 2-foot center. He put a piece in then and then black felted it back over and then they reshingled it after flashing it.

Mr. Cowhig said he thought the key thing the Commission needs to understand is that the proposal was to put the balcony railing back on a sloped foot without a pan, without an opening in the roof, and on the presumption that that is the way it was when Mr. Cassell began the work. There was no opening in the roof at that point in time. The description of work was to remove the railing.

Ms. Hatfield said when she left the last meeting expecting that they were going to see some sort of a sketch of what was going to happen to correct the situation.

Ms. Geary said at last month's meeting, mention was made that they still had the original railing.

Mr. Cassell said they had parts of it, but it was so rotten that it just falls apart when you pick it up.

Mr. Wharton asked for a clarification. He said if Mr. Cassell was simply repairing what was there in the course of his work, if he simply repairs the balcony as it had been and replaced elements that were deteriorated, he would not have needed a COA for that? Ms. Geary said that was correct.

Mr. Wharton said the Commission denied the application to remove. If he were simply to repair the elements that needed repair and replaced the elements that need replacing on the balcony as it was, you would not need a COA for that because, even though in the transition he has put roofing over and we told him he cannot do that, he cannot remove it. As far as he could tell, he does not need a COA to put it back the way it was before he started fixing it.

Mr. Cassell said that was what he was doing.

Mr. Wharton said he needed a determination from staff on this.

Counsel Williams said if you were placing like with like, due to deteriorated conditions, it is his understanding and his reading of the Guidelines and regulations that that is okay. Only if you were not putting it back the way that it was would you need a COA. If you are not changing the look of the thing, so you do not need our permission to do what he said last time. If the Commission has denied the application, if he goes back and restores it to the condition it was before he was cited, then he did not think this Commission needs to do anything more about it.

Ms. Hatfield said she did not agree that that is our position, although it may be she is misunderstanding, but she thought they were in the position that he had been notified that he is in violation and that the application was in order to get out of the violation. At this point, her questions will be: When you have done work and been cited, are we in that position that he had been cited?

Counsel Williams said he could have been cited in error. If you have to take it down to fix it and you are going to put it back, how do you replace it?

Ms. Freyaldenhoven asked if the original intention was to put it back?

Mr. Cassell said yes.

Mr. Stout said that was never mentioned last month. It was his understanding that Mr. Cassell said, "I do have it and I can put it back up like it was."

Counsel Williams said that was not in the application.

Mr. Cassell said Ms. Little did not want it there. That is why we were here because we have a Certificate of Appropriateness to do other work there, to paint the house, to fix the foundation, to do the front porch and roof and to replace any plywood that needed it. That was on their Certificate of Appropriateness that they already have. So when he went up there to do that part of it, he told Ms. Little, "The balcony is so rotten, it needs to be replaced too." She asked if they could do away with it. He had said he did not see

why not because he did not know that you could not make any changes to that. He said, "Of course, I guess we can," because he did not realize that they have to go back to the way that it looked or anything. He thought that they could, like everybody else does, repaint your house and it is okay.

Ms. Little had told Mr. Cassell that they had to have a COA to do the other work on the house and so he thought that would include whatever they had to do. This was his first time of dealing with that. So he then went up there and took it off and they reshingled over it. Then Mr. Cowhig came out and told him that he had to put that back. Now we are going to have to file for another COA to reinstall it. He has asked why would they have to do that because he could just set it up there the way it was. He said, "Well, let's go and find out." So that is what they are doing, they are trying to find out. Can he put it back the same way it was? He asked that same question the last time he was here.

Counsel Williams said if it gets put back and in order not to have a COA, it has to be exactly the way it was.

Mr. Cassell said he had all of it, except for a couple of pickets that just fell apart when they took it off. He has the majority of it so he can put it back. He could take the picture that is being shown and he can put it back where it will look the same way.

Mr. Stout asked would he not be in a different situation now? He has reroofed it, he pulls the roof out, puts the membrane in, is he not going to have to get inspections involved at this point and then that does trigger a COA?

Mr. Cassell said he had not done that though. He had told the Commission that he removed a 2' X 4' section of plywood and put back, which you do not need a permit for that. Then he put #15 black felt paper on it and then they shingled it after flashing against the house. The only thing he needs to do to make it back like it was is to rebuild the pickets exactly like they were and put it right back up there like it was with 4' X 6' corner posts on it, a 1' X 4' across the top and the bottom, put the pickets back in and up the sides with a rubber pieces up underneath it, screw it into the panel, caulk around it with a sealant and paint it white. That will put it right back the way it was before he ever started working on it.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven asked if she could just move that they maintain the original denial of the COA to remove the balcony railing and they just move ahead with restoring it?

Ms. Hatfield asked if they had to go further in the hearing first? Do we have to hear from other people?

Counsel Williams said this was to see if the Commission had heard enough evidence that you want to hear a reconsideration of your decision.

Mr. Stout said at this point, the Commission had heard quite a bit from Mr. Cassell and they should give the other people an opportunity to speak.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said that would not be necessary if they are just going to deny the reconsideration.

Ms. Geary said then he would be expected to put the railing back up.

Ms. Hatfield said she did not know that she would agree that that is necessarily the only way this could go.

Counsel Williams said the Commission was denying the fact that he cannot take it down. That is what you are denying. That was the request. It is the same request that it was last month. So unless you

have heard new information that is changing your mind about allowing him to put it back up, then there would be another issue for another day.

Ms. Hatfield said she agreed that it would be up to someone other than them to decide whether he should be cited if all he does is put the railing back up.

Mr. Cassell asked, "Cited for what?" He said he was not in violation. He took it down and Mr. Cowhig came out the same day and he explained to Mr. Cowhig the situation. Mr. Cowhig told him he had to file for a COA. He came last month, he asked if he could put it back, he said file another one, so what was he in violation of? Waiting on this to come every Wednesday? That is the only day he is in violation of.

Ms. Hatfield said that might be his opinion, but she did not think it was everybody's opinion.

Mr. Cassell said facts were facts. He said if they had a picture to show that that had a pan in it when the historic district took over, he would be glad to go in there and use his money to do it.

Ms. Hatfield said that was not something the Commission needed to decide. She agreed they could just vote, if everybody is in agreement, not to reconsider this. She thought that was the best.

Ms. Hensley said she did not think they had heard any substantial new evidence. It is essentially what they heard last month.

Counsel Williams told Mr. Cassell that the problem is that it was done prior to the application since it was an after-the-fact application, and nobody knows what it was like before.

Counsel Williams said if the Commission was going to open it up, you have to hear from the applicant as to whether or not you are going to have a public hearing. If your answer is no, we have all the information we need to deny the application, there is no need to go any further. If you are going to open it up to someone else, then you basically have to open it up.

Ms. Ayscue said if the Commission denies it, then the Commission is saying, "You have to put the railing back up the way it was."

Counsel Williams said what is on the agenda for today is a rehearing of the denial of the taking it down.

One of the Commissioners said that they do not actually have documentation pictures of the way it was, does that just make it hearsay?

Mr. Cassell said if they would look at the picture that was just up, you can tell it does not have any drain system or anything coming from it.

Counsel Williams said the Commission did not know when that picture was taken. He said if they were opening up the discussion, the vote should be to open up the discussion. If your vote is to close the discussion and not have a rehearing or not open it back up because you do not have any more information that is your choice. He did not think they could say: "We are going to hear a little bit, but we are not going to hear all."

Ms. Hatfield said if the new information is that we just did not understand that the roof had already been closed up and there really was not a pan there and Ms. Burns has information that there was a pan there, then that is really not about the discussion, that is about whether there is new information or not.

Counsel Williams said if the Commission voted to deny it, then you have already denied the fact that they cannot take the balcony down. You can only deny it once, unless you are going to hear new evidence that you are going to keep it down.

Ms. Hatfield said she just knew there was a person from the neighborhood who would like to speak and there needs to be a public hearing to do that. She said she did not want to reopen the hearing. However, if there were a way to let the person from the neighborhood have a say without opening the hearing, she would be happy to do that.

Mr. Cassell said if the Commission denies a rehearing, then he could go ahead and reinstall it the way that it was when he took it down; correct?

Ms. Hatfield said she did not think this Commission was saying that at all.

Mr. Cassell said if he was putting it back the way that it was, what was the problem?

Ms. Hatfield said she did not think the Commission was making any statement about that at all.

Counsel Williams said the Commission was not saying that, but Mr. Cassell could talk with staff about that.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that the Commission not reconsider the denied Application No. 791 for the permanent removal of the balcony railing at 912 Walker Avenue, seconded by Ms. Hensley. The Commission voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**c) Location: 808 Spring Garden Street**  
**Application No. 776**  
**Applicant: Josh Davis, Disaster Master**  
**Property Owner: Greg Stone**  
**Date Application Received: 6-22-06 (Granted with Conditions)**

#### **Description of Work**

Exterior alterations as part of fire damage repairs (after-the-fact)

#### **Staff comments and recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55-61), Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62-63), Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44-47)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:** The property was originally constructed as a single family craftsman bungalow. Sanborn Insurance maps dating to 1950 show the footprint of the structure as having a wrap-around front porch. However, at some point after 1950, a portion of the front porch was closed in and a door was added to accommodate the conversion from single-family to multi-family use.

**Fact:** Exterior alterations to the window and door fenestration pattern have been made to the front and west elevations of the closed-in area of the porch. Because these elevations were not original to the structure, flexibility should be granted in the approach to the repairs for this portion of the structure.



Specifically, the non-original second door and single window on the front elevation have been replaced with a new larger wood window. The removal of the door returns the structure to an appearance that is more in keeping with the historic single family use of the property. However, the wood window used should be a true-divided light window because of its prominence on a primary elevation.

**Fact:** On the west elevation where the porch was closed in, there was a non-original fenestration window pattern that resulted from the closing in of the porch. A wide board that marked the fascia of the porch roof also existed. The fire damage to the west elevation was extensive and required that the wood siding and other materials in this area of the west elevation be removed. Wood lap siding has been used to cover this area of the closed-in porch without replacing the non-original window fenestration pattern or the remaining board from the original wrap-around porch. The applicant returned the wall on the west elevation to the form in which it was prior to the fire damage but did not replace the non-original details to the house. However, original details of the porch roof such as brackets have been replaced to match.

#### ***Guidelines under Exterior Walls page 47***

7. It is not appropriate to introduce new features such as vents, bays, and window or door openings in exterior walls if they diminish the historic character of the structure.

#### ***Guidelines under Windows and Doors page 57***

1. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.

**Fact:** According to Building Inspections, prior to the fire, the porch flooring consisted of plywood sheets. While the porch flooring has not been replaced with true tongue and groove flooring, it has been replaced with a more compatible material other than plywood; 1" by 6" decking. The porch ceiling is tongue and groove.

Note: The porch steps currently do not meet building code and will be replaced with a riser height that is consistent with the code. There will be no change in materials or basic design.

#### ***Guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies page 64***

3. If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size and ornamentation.

**Fact:** The original windows in the gable ends have been expanded and replaced with vinyl windows. The second story is not usable as living space according to building inspections and therefore removing and enlargement of the window opening is not required by building code. This change was not necessary.

2. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are

compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.

3. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.

**Conditions:**

- 1) That the windows in the gable ends be replaced with true divided light windows that match the dimensions of the original windows as seen in earlier documentation. And that the window detailing is consistent with historic window detailing.
- 2) That the front elevation window be replaced with a wood window with true divided lights in a muntin pattern that is consistent with large windows found in craftsman bungalows.

**In support:**

Greg Stone, 4 Pipes Glen Court, previously sworn or affirmed.

**In opposition:**

Jennifer Burns, 125 South Mendenhall, previously sworn or affirmed; represented College Park Neighborhood Association.

**Rebuttal in support:**

Greg Stone, 4 Pipes Glen Court.

**Summary:**

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 776, 808 Spring Garden Street. This is an after-the-fact application. The applicant was Josh Davis of Disaster Master. Description of work was repair exterior fire damage. Staff recommends approval with conditions, citing Guidelines 1, pages 55-61, 3 and 2, pages 62-63 and 7, pages 44-47. Staff said in 1950 the house on the Sanborn map shows it still had a wraparound porch, but the enclosure was probably not original to the house. The applicant removed the second front door and a small window and added one large window. He also commented that it was now more in keeping with the appearance of how the house should be. He stated that the windows should be a true divided light. There was a note that a fascia board on the porch was not the same.

Ms. Geary said the leftover fascia board that delineated the original porch was removed when they redid the side.

Continuing, Chair Bowers said the house had been fire damaged. Staff said the porch had been plywood sheets and now was a 1X6 board. The steps are now in compliance, but the porch will not change and will be rebuilt in compliance with code. The original windows that were in the upper level of the house were changed, but Ms. Geary stated that they were not necessary by code and they are now vinyl windows.

The conditions suggested by staff are the windows and gables to be replaced with wood, true divided light windows back to the original size and that the front elevation windows needs to be a true divided light. Staff suggested that the applicant speak with Architectural Salvage about their programs. They stated the overall work was very good and they had been working with staff. When the question about

the other bungalows as to what kind of windows should be in the upper level, there would be research done to support that.

Speaking in support of the application was Greg Stone, 4 Pipers Glen Court, who passed around pictures of the upstairs windows where they were previously vinyl. He enlarged them so that the bedroom and bath that is actually up there would be more usable by be able to use a larger unit in the air conditioning. He also passed around pictures of the original porch. He had spoken to Architectural Salvage about a grant, but did feel that he feel like he needed to move ahead. He said that he was trying to put the house back like it was, but nicer than it was but could not afford to put it back totally historically. He stated that the new windows were probably about six inches wider than the old windows.

Speaking in opposition was Jennifer Burns, 125 South Mendenhall Street, speaking on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She said they appreciated the work, but could not support an after-the-fact application. The porch was better, but not meeting the Guidelines. She also commented that the left side of the house had no windows and she had concerns about that and also concerns that there were no documentary photos made after the fire and concerns about the permit process. She commented that the two doors appeared to look like apartments and that commented on the zoning issue about code, about one year change in how codes were handled. They discussed windows, both up and down, at their meeting and again expressed distress about after-the-fact applications.

Speak in rebuttal was Greg Stone, 4 Pipers Glen Court, who said he had been in the house since 1996 and he had gotten notices on his door, but had not ever been contacted by anyone in the Neighborhood Association. He said since 1996, it had not been apartments and he was trying to put it back like it was before, but nicer and the whole process was making him less interested in being part of the neighborhood restorations.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Stout asked staff if this house had even come before the Commission? Mr. Stone's comments made it sound like we were holding up process and he did not remember seeing this before.

Ms. Geary said he had just had to work through because of it being fire damage and an older building. She just thought it had been quite a lot of bureaucratic hoops, with us being one of those steps. This is the first time that this property has come before the Commission.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said with the conditions staff had put on this, it seemed that staff was not aware of the photos that Mr. Stone has that indicates that there were former replacement windows in there.

Ms. Geary said that is absolutely correct so they would modify their conditions. When she had met with the property owner and Design Review Committee, she actually encouraged the property owner to go through boxes and find if you have pictures that show that those windows were not original or that the original windows were not in that place any longer. And that is exactly what he had done. When they did staff comments, they could only go on the information that they had. She would have a hard time as staff requiring him to remove those windows for a change that had been made prior to his owning the property. She did not know if there were really any legal grounds for her having that, but from a customer service perspective, that would be the approach that she would probably take.

Counsel Williams said they did not know that that change was made prior to it becoming in the historic district or after. It was prior to his ownership, but unfortunately you take the house as you get it when you get a piece of property. It was his understanding that if you get a house that had work done that

was not in compliance that you take the house as you get it. However, we do not know whether the original windows were out at the time that it came into the historic district or not.

Ms. Geary said Mr. Stone's pictures show that the porch was like a 1X6 so he thought Building Inspections was mistaken when they told her that they thought it was just flat plywood. She also did not know the use for the second floor.

Ms. Geary said in possibly the 1976 survey, it shows a smaller, more rectangular window in the front and then the door next to it.

Ms. Hatfield said it seemed to her that what they were dealing with was a lot of things that were changed that we do not really know when they were changed and so now he has come in and he is starting from non-original materials. Her question was: Just because you have got non-original materials, like a non-original window, does that mean that once it is non-original, that we do not have any say so in what should go in its place if they replace it?

Ms. Geary said she thought that was what Counsel Williams was addressing earlier, that if you buy a house that in 1990 the back windows were all replaced with vinyl windows without a COA and then someone issues a violation, you are responsible for that violation even though you were not the property owner that put those vinyl windows in. From a legal standpoint, that would be the approach. However, from a customer service standpoint, it kind of becomes sticky for us.

Ms. Hatfield said if she walked in someone's house and saw when they purchased it that it had vinyl windows, it would be hard for her to tell that person to go back and change those. On the other hand, if they are going to change those windows, she was wondering why the Commission could not require that a new window on a primary elevation is a true divided light and compatible.

From staff's perspective, what they are saying is that for the front window, they do want that to be true divided light, wood windows. As to the gable end windows, because he's presented information that shows that those were vinyl windows to begin with, if she were rewriting staff comments with that information, she would have taken a different approach precisely because of same logic that you just said. She would not want to hold him responsible.

The question was asked about the windows on the right side and if that was a fire issue?

Ms. Geary mean like there are issues in the repair because of fire damage. She did not think that those windows would have been changed out had he not started doing work on the house for the fire damage. So all of this is being triggered because there was damage done. She understood and agreed with what you are saying. She thought the differences in this situation are he just did not say one day, "I'm just going to make these windows bigger." He kind of found himself in the situation of, "Well, I have got to replace the siding on this side," and she really did not know what his thought process was, but going in that direction I will have an opportunity to replace the windows because of other issues that have happened to the house and so here I am. She said, "I do understand what you are saying and I agree with it."

Ms. Hatfield said she felt they had some pretty clear Guidelines about what kind of windows should go in historic structures. And if he is going to put new windows in, that he ought to follow those Guidelines; end of story. She did not want to come in and tell him what to do about something if he is not already doing it, but if he is doing the work, then he ought to follow the Guidelines.

Counsel Williams said except that you could replace like with like materials.

Ms. Hatfield said you could repair it, you cannot replace it.

Mr. Cowhig said he would like to clarify one thing. The windows in the gable end were the item that the Design Review Committee probably had the most concern with and it is the fact that they are vinyl windows and also they were trimmed out when they enlarged the opening and the trim pieces do not match the rest of the house. There is no windowsill on those. So he thought that was an area where if those windows could be replaced with a compatible windows, the Design Committee at least felt like that would be a major improvement.

Ms. Hatfield said that although these were not at the front of the house, they are fairly visible from the street and she did think that was important. So she personally thought if there was going to be work done, that it ought to be done right.

Ms. Kelly asked if anyone could clarify for her if there were any Guidelines around window units? She was advised that there was nothing on that.

Mr. Stout agreed with Ms. Hatfield that there was an issue of repairing like with like, but replacing does require that it come before the Commission.

Mr. Wharton asked Ms. Hatfield if she felt the conditions meet what she was talking about? The first one says: The windows in the gable ends be replaced with true divided light windows that match the dimensions of the original windows as seen in earlier documentation. That the window detailing be consistent with historic window detailing.

Ms. Hatfield said she still felt that was appropriate.

Mr. Stout said he thought that was right too.

Mr. Wharton said he also supported it as staff has it.

Ms. Hatfield said she thought it was fine to go in and change the window in the front elevation around. It was awful with that other door anyway. She agreed, he was trying to make it better and she thought it was on the right track, but still had to use the right materials.

Mr. Wharton said he also was impressed with the work Mr. Stone had done so far and he knew that the wood lapped siding was expensive. He needed a little bit of it himself, so maybe he would talk to him about his source.

### **Finding of fact:**

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 776 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as follows are acceptable as findings of fact. Staff comments are that the property was originally constructed as a single family Craftsman bungalow. Sanborn Insurance Maps dating to 1950 showed the footprint and the structure as having a wraparound front porch. However, at some point after 1950, the portion of the front porch was closed in and a door was added to accommodate the conversion from single family to multifamily use. The exterior alterations to the window and door fenestration pattern have been made to the front and west elevations of the closed in area of the porch. Because these elevations were not original to the structure, flexibility should be granted in the approach to the repairs for this portion of the

structure. Specifically the non-original second door and single window on the front elevation have been replaced with a new, larger wooden window. The removal of the door returns the structure to an appearance that is more in keeping with the historic single family use of the property. However, the wood window used should be a true divided light window because of its prominence on a primary elevation. On the west elevation where the porch was closed in, there was a non-original fenestration window pattern that resulted from the enclosing in of the porch. A wide board that marked the fascia of the porch roof also existed. The fire damage to the west elevation was extensive and required that the wood siding and other materials in this area of the west elevation be removed. Wood lapped siding has been used to cover this area. The closed in porch without the placing of a non-original window fenestration pattern or the remaining board from the original wraparound porch. The applicant returned the wall on the west elevation to the form in which it was prior to the fire damage, but did not replace the non-original details to the house. However, original details of the porch roof, such as brackets, have been replaced to match.

Ms. Geary asked Ms. Hatfield if she were citing all the staff comments? If not, you can just say staff comments.

Ms. Hatfield said they went through this and at one point they said that on ones that might be questionable, that they wanted to make sure that everything was read into the record. So she was just not sure.

Ms. Geary said she thought Ms. Hatfield was okay because the way staff set it up, the reason that they read it into the record fully and so they are in the record and so can just refer to the staff comments as they were read into the record earlier.

Ms. Hatfield said she then would just refer back to the prior reading in the record of the rest of the staff comments. Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: Freyaldenhoven.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 776 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greg Stone and Josh Davis of Disaster Master, for work at 808 Spring Garden Street, with the following conditions: 1) That the windows in the gable ends be replaced with true divided light windows that match the dimensions of the original windows or as seen in an earlier documentation or as are appropriate in similar bungalow homes in the neighborhood and that the window detailing is consistent with the historic window detailing, especially in how the window is trimmed out; that the front elevation be replaced with a wood window with true divided lights and a muntin pattern that is consistent with the large windows found in Craftsman bungalows or matching the pattern of the house.

Mr. Wharton asked if she would add that they wanted the staff on that?

Ms. Hatfield said yes, adding that staff will review the choice of windows and the proposed trim and can approve those at staff level. Ms. Hensley seconded the motion as amended. The Commission voted 8-1 in favor of the motion as amended. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: Freyaldenhoven.)

Chair Bowers said Ms. Freyaldenhoven needed to leave at 7 o'clock and Ms. Ayscue needed to leave at 6 o'clock and she would like for the Commission to go ahead and vote on these.

Mr. Wharton moved that Ms. Freyaldenhoven be excused at 7 o'clock and Ms. Ayscue be excused at 6 o'clock, seconded by Ms. Hensley. The Commission voted 7-0-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None. Abstain: Ayscue, Freyaldenhoven.)

Chair Bowers said the Commission would take a quick break (5:45 - 5:50 p.m.).

- d) Location: 923 N. Eugene Street**  
**Application No. 788**  
**Applicant: Mitchell Parsons, Architect**  
**Property Owner: Paul Young**  
**Date Application Received: 7-12-06 (Granted)**

**Description of Work**

Construction of addition to house.

**Staff comments and recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76)* and *Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

**Fact No. 1:** The property is a single story craftsman bungalow in the Fisher Park Historic District.

**Fact No. 2:** The proposed addition is at the rear of the property and will not be visible from the street. It is a one story addition above a basement and will not extend above the existing roof line. The project footprint includes both heated square footage and a covered porch over an extension of the existing basement. The project maintains a 33' buffer between the rear property line and the addition. This is 13 feet additional to the required 20 foot set-back.

**Fact No. 3:** The project proposes to expand an existing window bay on the north side elevation reusing the existing windows and details.

**Guideline 4:** Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.

**Guideline 5:** Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.

**Fact No. 4:** The design and details are compatible with the architectural style of the house and add new detailing like transom windows and foundation windows. The addition will also re-use existing historic windows where possible and/or wood windows as allowed on the new construction materials list in the guidelines. The project will use hardiboard® siding materials, Mount Airy stone with grapevine mortar for the foundation and masonry porch details, and wood materials on the porch flooring and ceiling. The roof will be asphalt composition to match the existing. Brackets will be reused and new brackets will be manufactured to match the original where needed.

**Guideline 1:** In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.

**Fact No. 5:** Changes in material such as the use of hardiboard siding and recently quarried Mount Airy stones (which have a difference in patina and coloring) will help to differentiate the historic structure from the addition. A drop in the roof height will also serve to delineate the new from the old.

**Guideline 2:** Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.

**Fact No. 6:** The project may require the removal of two trees that are positioned close to the existing structure.

Note: If these trees are to remain, a tree protection plan should be submitted.

**Guidelines Under Trees and Landscaping page 23:**

1. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.
5. Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.
6. Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work. Refer to the Tree Protection Guide in the appendix on this document for specific precautions and requirements.

**Conditions:**

1. That a landscaping plan be submitted to staff.
2. That clarification is made regarding the trees at the rear of the property that may require removal.
3. That a tree protection plan be submitted to staff (see page 86 of the Guidelines).

**In support:**

Mitchell Parsons, architect, 507 North Church Street, sworn or affirmed.

Ms. Ayscue left at 6:00 p.m.

**In opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 788 for work at 923 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Mitchell Parsons. The work described is an addition. Staff comments were to approve with conditions, citing Guidelines 4,5 and 1, page 75-76 and Guidelines 5 and 6, pages 21-23. It is a Craftsman bungalow. The addition is going to be at the rear. It is not visible from the street and includes a covered porch. It maintains a 33-foot buffer. They will reuse windows and brackets and make new brackets where necessary to match. The Design Review Committee was impressed with the quality. Staff reviewed the finishes. The second part is that they will necessarily lose two trees to be removed. The conditions were that the landscape plan be submitted to staff with the confirmation of these two trees being removed and also a tree protection plan needs to be submitted to staff.

Speaking in support of the application was Mitchell Parsons, 607 North Church Street, who met with the Homeowners Association and they had noted a drafting error, that the chimney had been left off and the Commission was assured that the chimney would remain. He confirmed that no work was going to be done on the front or sides of the house, reviewed the plan, showed where the deck was going to go and



said they would be reusing windows, reusing brackets or replicating; they are using a Mount Airy stone foundation and grapevine detailing. He reviewed the plans.

There was no one else to speak in support of the application and there was no one to speak in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Comments were made that it looked nicely done and there was no exception to anything.

**Finding of fact:**

Mr. Stout moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 788 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that all of staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley, Hatfield, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore Mr. Stout moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 788 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mitchell Parsons, architect, and Paul Young, property owner, for the work at 923 North Eugene Street with the following conditions: That a landscaping plan be submitted to staff and that a tree protection plan be submitted to staff, utilizing Page 86 of the Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- d)      **Location: 600 Fifth Avenue**  
           **Application No. 781**  
           **Applicant: John and Judy Worsley**  
           **Property Owner: Same**  
           **Date Application Received: 6-18-06 (Denied)**

**Description of Work**

"Remove extra front door and side over opening," after-the-fact.

**Staff comments and recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)* for the following reasons:

**Fact No. 1:** The property was originally constructed between 1900-1905 as a single family residence. Since that time, the wrap around porch has been closed in and an additional door had been added to accommodate the building's conversion from single-family to multi-family use. According to City Directories, the property was used for single family residency until 1939 when it is listed as 600 and 600 ½ Fifth Avenue for the first time. However, the structure appears to not have been physically changed until after 1950, according to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. In 1950, the wrap around porch is still present as part of the footprint of the building inferring that the closed in porch and the door that was removed as part of this application, were not added until after 1950, if not later.

**Fact No. 2:** While the application does not restore the original wrap-around front porch, the removal of the second front door allows the front elevation of this building to be more in keeping with the single family use that is original to the property.

**Fact No. 3:** The door was removed and replaced with wood horizontal lap siding to match the original.

**Guidelines page 57:**

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.
2. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided

The Commission discussed either continuing the application or denying it. Since the 60-day rule was in affect, staff pointed out that it could not be continued since the applicant was not present to agree and the Commission could only deny it.

Counsel Williams said if the Commission denied it for lack of evidence or need of information from the homeowner, who was not in attendance, and would consider rehearing it, if requested by the homeowner. Any evidence that would be brought would be new and the Commission could decide whether that was enough for the Commission to hear it. We know that there would be a piece of new evidence for the Commission to hear and that would be the new pictures.

**In support:**

None.

**In opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Bowers said this is Application 781 for work at 600 Fifth Avenue. The applicants are John and Judy Worsley. The description of work is to remove a front door and siding over the opening. It an after-the-fact application. Staff recommends approving, citing Guidelines 1 and 2, pages 55-61. Staff said it was a single family house until 1939. The closed in porch was sometime around 1950. Siding matched and the Design Review Committee looked at it. Mr. Wharton commented that it would be possible to add a window. There was a discussion about looking at the photographs survey from two years ago to see the conditions and then Commission agreed that there was not enough evidence.

There was no one present to speak in support of or in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Finding of fact:**

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 781 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines*, specifically Guideline No. 1, page 47, preserve original floor materials and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary replace only the deteriorated material or detail with a new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern and detail. The appropriateness of substitute of materials is reviewed based on size, shape, texture, pattern and details as compared to original material and when available, past performance of the material in documented cases. Also Guideline No. 1, page 57, to retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Since in this case the placement of the door opening in relation to other elements of the porch appears to have been changed and the Commission needs more evidence to determine whether that is true. These are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Hensley seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Stout moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application No. 781 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to John and Judy Worsley for work at 600 Fifth Avenue. Ms. Freyaldenhoven seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:****Recommendation to City Council for New Chair.**

Chair Bowers said Mr. Stout had been the Co-Chair, so she would nominate Mr. Stout to be the new Chairman of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission since he has been chairman-in-training. Ms. Hatfield seconded the nomination. The Commission voted 7-0-1 in favor of the nomination. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Kelly, Wharton. Nays: None. Abstain: Stout.)

After discussion, it was decided that the Commission would wait until the August meeting to nominate and elect a Vice Chair for the Commission.

Mr. Stout said he brought the information on the competition for infill design from the City of Wilmington. He had sent it to most of the Commissioners by e-mail. This might be something to drop a hint that Greensboro could do something like this for infill design.

Mr., Stout said he also had an update from the National Trust. He said if anyone were interested, he would forward it to them by e-mail. Ms. Geary suggested that he send it to her and she would send it out with the distribution list that she had for the Commission.

**ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:****a) 112 West Hendrix Street - progress report on work to meet Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect.**

Ms. Geary said staff would like to postpone this to the August meeting. The property owner had wanted to attend, but could not be here tonight. Therefore, she would like it postponed until the August meeting.

**b) Commissioners' Training.**

Ms. Geary said in the packet of information on Commissioners' training. She said staff would like for them to get in the habit of having quarterly training sessions, particularly since they have so many new members. This would get everybody together so they could learn the same things again. What is in front of you is the proposed curriculum and proposed months of holding those meetings. Staff would like to start in August, which would serve as a "back to basics" going over the fundamental ideas of the Historic Preservation Commission and the ordinance, guidelines, preamble to the guidelines and some of you were on the Commission when they used to do lunchtime training sessions where they would provide lunch for the Commissioners and have a little program. They would like to do it a little different this time by having an outside facilitator do that meeting so that staff can participate as well. In November, there are some new legal issues that have arisen, particularly in conflict of interest cases. There are also things about purview and Roberts' Rules of Order, just things that are always good to brush up on. Rich Decker with the Institute of Government does a really good at that. They do not know if they can get him in November, but ideally that is what they would like to shoot for and bring him in to do a session with the Commission. For early 2007, they would like this to be a lunchtime session. They are lucky because in their office Sue Schwartz, who is the current AICP President. She actually teaches the Code of Ethics course for students studying to take the AICP examination. So staff had thought that would be a good opportunity to have to a bit of a training or presentation on Code of Ethics and customer courtesy, etc. Then in May for this cycle, something on new materials and technological advancements. A lot of times we are faced with new materials and none of us have seen it before and they do not know whether or not it is something that we really want to use in the historic districts. But if we know that it has been used in a tax credit project or something like that, they might be more inclined to allow it in our historic districts or not allow it in our historic districts. What she would like to do today is try and get some tentative dates for an August lunchtime training session. If you do not have your calendars with you, that is fine. You could just e-mail her preferred dates that would work as well and they can try and set something up in the next couple of days in order to get it on everyone's calendar. A date near the end of August would probably give a little more scheduling time.

The date of Friday, September 8 at lunchtime was discussed for the first dinner training session. The Commissioners were to notify Ms. Geary if this fit their schedules.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Jennifer Burns, 126 South Mendenhall Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association, said she had a couple of concerns.

- a) Since the HEAT transportation was not really dealt with in public hearing, she wanted to thank the Commission for supporting the neighborhood. Although this was not the most appropriate venue and they need not go into it in terms of fighting the HEAT transportation, the stance the Commission took was really what it took to get the City of Greensboro's Transportation to listen to the Association. Amazingly after the Commission denied it, the City was somehow able to reach somewhat of a compromise and it was enough that the Association felt it could support Greensboro College.

She asked if the Commission would be able to write GDOT a letter to consider the impact to the Neighborhood. As it stands now, the HEAT buses will travel up and down all three blocks of Tate Street that are residential. The Association had proposed four different alternatives with none of those really being consider whatsoever. One route, coming from UNCG, would up to the 300 block of Tate Street, turn left onto Carr and cut over to McIver, which is more in line where the University stuff is. They told the Association that would take five minutes and that was unacceptable. They are trying to accomplish their route in 60 minutes and would rather

inconvenience the neighborhood and its people rather than inconvenience the students who plan on riding it. In listening to the City Council meeting last night, it sounded as if the college shuttles would also increase their frequency from one an hour to two and hour. She could not confirm this and she did not know if that is specific to UNCG or to any of the others. She did know that the UNCG shuttle that runs on the 300 block of Tate Street is the one with the strobe light. She asked if there were anything she needed to do to formally ask the Commission to write a letter in support?

Counsel Williams said if this were the wish of the Commission to write a letter in support, if it were coming from the Commission then you basically would have to have a majority of the Commissioner. Individual Commissioners could write what they wished.

Ms. Burns said they would like for the Commission to thank GDOT for making the current accommodations to the neighborhood, but encourage them to continue to work with the neighborhood to eliminate or at least lessen the impact to the neighborhood. The neighborhood's ultimate goal is to remove all of the 300 block of Tate Street from their route. They have suggested a compromise that would remove everything in the neighborhood with the exception of the 300 block of Tate Street. She said they would want the Commission to courage GDOT to work with the neighborhood. The last time she spoke with them she was given the feeling that it is done.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven left the meeting.

Ms. Coleman said this would impact the whole City. It was going to be trial and error for a couple of months so she thought it was important to stay in touch your Association during this trial and error process because she saw a lot, just based on the preliminary plans that she saw, it is going to be rough going.

Ms. Coleman moved that the Commission write a letter to GDOT just asking them to be in communication with the College Hill Association as they move through continued planning for this program.

Ms. Geary suggested that they actually write the letter to the Greensboro Transit Authority. That is the actual body that is overseeing that project and staff actually received a letter from them. Greensboro College actually applied, but technically it should have been GTA that applied for the COA.

It was also suggested that copying the City Council with the letter would not be a bad idea either.

Ms. Coleman said the letter would go to the Transit Authority with a copy to the Greensboro City Council.

Ms. Coleman revised her motion and moved that the Commission prepare a letter to the Greensboro Transit Authority asking if they would continue communication with College Hill Neighborhood Association and other neighbors that may be impacted by this transportation system. Mr. Stout seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Coleman, Hensley, Hatfield, Kelly, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- b) Ms. Burns said the last thing she wanted to address was with regard to the Walker property that was discussed in terms of the denial of the application. She guessed this was more of a comment to staff. She knew that they have several things that they have done, the removal of the second floor porch, unpainted brick has been painted as was the front elevation of the brick has been stuccoed and they have also done iron rails, all after-the-fact. With regards to the

porch, just so it is in the record, the photograph that was handed around came out of the College Hill Neighborhood Association's records and she believed the Neighborhood Association was informed about the same time that the College Hill District was. From her own recollections, that house has never really changed since she had been there, which was only four years, but if you look in that picture, that door is in that picture and that door was the door that they removed. So he is claiming that they had already roofed up to that door and she did not believe that was correct because she doubted that they would have just roofed over the door.

Another aspect is that in the College Hill Concept Plan, the date of which she was not sure, it is the buff colored one, there is a line drawing showing that house with the porch insert or the cut into that roofline. Again this comes back to the after-the-fact applications. We do not know what was there; we do not know what could have been there. It is just really unfortunate and she really would encourage the Commission and City staff to implement fines. They had one instance last year where a porch column that had been done for well over three years (was taken out during a storm). Once they finally started being fined, within one to two weeks it was up. So these fines are really important to the neighborhood.

Mr. Stout asked where they stood with fines? When are fines imposed and when are they not imposed?

Ms. Geary said fines are imposed when violations are sent, the Zoning Enforcement Office puts fine on it. She did not know what the schedule was, but they are not as aggressive as she thought the neighborhoods would like them to be. The level of fining is really out of staff's authority and the aggressiveness of the fining comes from the Zoning Enforcement. She told Mr. Stout when he was Chair, it would be appropriate for him to speaking to the Zoning Enforcement Office to get that moving. She felt time would be better spent creating a dialogue between the Zoning Enforcement Office and the Historic Preservation Commission to figure out why it takes so long for fines to be imposed and levied. She said staff would do some preparation for a meeting like that.

There was a discussion among staff and the Commissioners about the fines situation. Staff made some suggestions and said they would assist whenever possible.

## **ADJOURN**

Chair Bowers said the next meeting date was August 30, 2006. She adjourned the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/jd.ps